

S/N: 09/909,813  
ND-395 US (HAR.013)

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 1-12, and 15-25 are allowed. Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by US Patent 6,490,259 to Agrawal et al.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent format. However, Applicants believe that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

It is noted that Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

The prior art rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following discussion.

#### **I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION**

Applicant's invention, as disclosed and claimed in independent claim 13, is directed to a route updating method for a micromobility network, wherein routers are connected in a tree configuration having a plurality of layers and extending up in layers to a root router connected to an external network and radio base stations are connected to the routers in a lowest layer of said tree configuration, including receiving, in a router in a layer of the tree, a routing updating notification packet from a next lower layer and updating the routing in the router. The packet includes an update reaching range defining a highest level in the tree connection to which the updating notification is to be transmitted.

The conventional method described beginning at line 14 of page 1 of the specification requires that the routing updates be reflected all the way back to the root node of the tree.

In contrast, the present invention provides a method by which an updated routing is transmitted up the tree configuration only to the level in the tree configuration necessary to reflect the updated routing, thereby reducing the amount of resources needed for processing updating notifications. Moreover, because each layer receiving the update notification packet from the next lower layer will be able to determine whether it should forward the packet to the next higher layer, the method of the present invention is readily scalable.

S/N: 09/909,813  
ND-395 US (HAR.013)

## II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

The Examiner alleges that Agrawal anticipates the present invention as defined by claim 13. However, Applicants submit that claim 13 defines at least one feature that is not present in Agrawal.

Specifically, the Examiner considers, as best understood, that the description in lines 6-67 of column 4, lines 29-44 of column 5, and lines 14-45 of column 12 satisfies the claim limitations in claim 13 concerning a packet containing an update reaching range defining a highest level in the tree configuration for an updating notification to be transmitted.

Applicants respectfully disagree, since it appears that the Examiner's position is primarily based on the description in lines 14-45 of column 12. As best understood, the Examiner considers this description to relate to an updating notification when the mobile terminal changes to a new base station. However, Applicants submit that one having ordinary skill in the art would consider this description as a generic updating message that step (6) shows as merely being propagated throughout the hierarchy. There appears to be no description of inclusion of information relating to any limitation that the normal propagation throughout the hierarchy is to be limited, let alone limited by the mechanism of the present invention.

Hence, Applicants submit that this description in lines 14-45 of column 12 fails to satisfy the description in the claim that there is an update reaching range included in each notification packet that defines the highest level of the tree to which the notification packet is to be transmitted. Indeed, steps 5 and 6 would seem to indicate that the new information will be sent upwards throughout the entire tree structure, presumably all the way back to the root. Again, if the Examiner wishes to persist in this rejection based on Agrawal, it is requested that the precise location in these lines be identified relative to a suggestion of an update reaching range as being included in the notification packet.

Hence, turning to the clear language of the claims, in Agrawal there is no teaching or suggestion of: “...said packet including an update reaching range defining a highest level in said tree connection to which said updating notification is to be transmitted”, as required by claim 13.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that Agrawal fails to teach or suggest every feature of claim 13, and that, therefore, this claim is clearly

S/N: 09/909,813  
ND-395 US (HAR.013)

patentable over this reference.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection currently of record for claim 13.

### III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-25, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

2/1/06



Frederick E. Cooperrider  
Reg. No. 36,769

**McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
**Customer No. 21254**